



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,853	12/30/2003	Carl J. Wheeler	1530.0260002	6433
26111	7590	03/16/2006	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			GRAFFEO, MICHEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,853	WHEELER, CARL J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michel Graffeo	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 64-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 64-90 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 64-70 and 83-86, drawn to a method of delivering an anionic molecule into a cell, classified in class 514, subclass 509.
- II. Claims 71-74 and 87-88, drawn to a method of delivering an anionic molecule into a cell classified in class 514, subclass 513.
- III. Claims 75-78 and 89-90, drawn to a method of delivering an anionic molecule into a cell, classified in class 514, subclass 724.
- IV. Claims 79-82, drawn to a method of delivering an anionic molecule into a cell classified in class 514, subclass 529.

Inventions I and II are related as products which share an alleged common utility of delivering an anionic molecule into a cell, but the common utility is not linked to a substantial structural feature. The products in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the products encompass embodiments that are not required to perform the common utility or (2) that the products as claimed can be used to perform another utility. In this case, the products can be used to perform another utility. See Parker, Suezanne E. et al. Cancer gene therapy using plasmid DNA: safety evaluation in rodents and non-human primates. Human Gene Therapy (1995), 6(5), 575-90. Inventions I-IV all differ as explained above.

Accordingly, Applicant is required to make an election of one of the Groups above and further, in addition, Applicant is required to make an election of one species therein as discussed below.

The practice, re: Markush claims encompassing multiple independent and patentably distinct inventions is set forth in M.P.E.P. 803. The following requirement to make a provisional election of a single independent and patentably distinct invention is made pursuant to said practice.

Claims 64-90 are drawn in Markush format encompass multiple and patentably distinct inventions. The claims are either drawn to different methods of delivering an anionic molecule to a cell. It is pointed out that the claims are directed to compounds which can include an amino acid, peptide, polypeptide, protein, nucleic acid, nucleotide, polynucleotide, mono, di- or polysaccharide, or other bioactive or pharmaceutical agent. Peptide containing compounds are classified in class 514 subclass 2 and are independent and distinct inventions from the Groups listed above.

The groups above are set forth in order of precedence in the claims. Any specie/compound/composition having the distinguishing feature set forth in one of the above groups will be contained in that group regardless of the fact that it may also contain a feature set forth in a group of lower precedence.

Art Unit: 1614

It is considered that at Markush type claim encompassing such species is directed to multiple independent and patentably distinct inventions since the species are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claims with respect to one of the species will not render the claim anticipated or obvious under 35 U.S.C. 102 nor 35 U.S.C. 103 respectively with regard to any one other of the species. Further these species are considered to be independent since they are unconnected in operation, one does not require the others for ultimate use and the specification does not disclose a dependent relationship between them. Moreover, each of the stated species is considered patentably distinct from the others on the basis of its properties. Thus, the stated species are capable of supporting separate patents under 35 U.S.C. 121.

Accordingly, applicants are required to make a provisional election of a single independent and /or patentably distinct Invention from Groups I-IV and further to elect an independent species of compound which either contains a peptide or the like or a not (heteroatom for example) prior to an examination of said species on the merits.

Regardless of which invention Applicant elects, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Specifically, applicant is required to define each of R^1 , R^2 , R^3 , R^4 , R^5 , R^6 , R^7 , n, m, Z and W and any additional variables as required for a particular species. Currently, claims 64, 71, 75 and 79 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Election/Restrictions Proper

MPEP §809.02(d) states “[w]here only generic claims are presented, no restriction can be required except in those applications where the generic claims recite such a multiplicity of species that an unduly extensive and burdensome search is necessary.”. Here, the claims recited such a multiplicity of species that an unduly

Art Unit: 1614

extensive and burdensome search would be necessary if all of the claimed species were to be examined simultaneously.

The present claims are directed to a method of treating respiratory complaints. Present claim 1 for example provides a variety of possibilities for R^1 , R^2 , R^3 , R^4 , R^5 , R^6 , R^7 , n, m, Z and W. For hypothetical exemplification purposes only, if each of the variables above were each limited to 10 possible moieties there would be 10^{11} possible species of compounds to be searched.

Further, as shown by the following classifications, a majority of the combinations encompassed by the present claims has acquired a separate status in the art. For example, if either R^3 or R^4 is a 7 membered ring containing one N it is classified in class 514 subclass 212.01, whereas if either R^3 or R^4 is a 6 membered ring containing one N it is classified in class 514 subclass 222.2. Notwithstanding that the classification of some of the active agents is co-extensive, all of the claimed compounds are patently distinct and fully capable of supporting separate patents.

For the above reasons, an election of a single disclosed species for examination purposes is deemed necessary and proper.

A telephone call was made to Matthew Dowd on 8 March 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the

requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Graffeo whose telephone number is 571-272-8505. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am to 5:30pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

13 March 2006
MG

mb

Christopher S. F. Low
CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600